

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 17, 2005. Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 11 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,702; hereinafter "Shimizu"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 4,694,453; hereinafter "Kobayashi"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Schenkyr (U.S. Patent No. 5,218,600; hereinafter "Schenkyr"). Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections for at least the following reasons.


Shimizu fails to recite or suggest a pilot signal generated by the at least one network node where the network node is remote from the star node and star interfaces. Shimizu recites in Col. 7, lines 50-55 that "Timing circuit 20 applies a series of timing pulses . . . to the arbiter line 16 at periodic intervals. . . ." Timing circuit 20 in Shimizu, as depicted in Shimizu Fig. 3, is situated within arbiter 3 (see Shimizu Fig. 1) which is within the star node as shown in Shimizu Fig. 1, as opposed to the user terminals that are remote to the star node and that correspond to Applicants' network nodes. Thus Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection of Claims 1, 10 and 11 over Shimizu, because the reference fails to recite or suggest every limitation of Applicants' Claims 1, 10, and 11.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully believe Claims 2-9 to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim. Applicants further

believe the § 103 rejections of Claims 4 and 9 to be moot in light of the above remarks and request their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Adam L. Stroud,  
Reg. No. 48,410  
Attorney  
(408) 474-9064  
March 31, 2005